DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 149 TM 006 472

AUTHOR Silbermann, David J.
TITLE The First Use of the Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) in Prekindergarten Head Start 1976-1977. Report Number 77137.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE May 77
GRANT H-3112
NOTE 23p.; For related documents, see TM 006 514 and 515

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; Behavior Rating Scales; *Check Lists; Criterion Referenced Tests; Diagnostic Tests; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Individual Development; Item Analysis; Measurement Techniques; Observation; Preschool Education; Preschool Teachers; *Preschool Tests; Teacher Attitudes; *Test Reliability; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS Learning Accomplishment Profile (Sanford); Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

Prekindergarten Head Start teachers were trained to administer the Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP), an objective check list of development in seven areas: gross motor, fine motor manipulation and writing, social, self help, cognitive, and language skills. Data were collected from separate groups of 3, 4, and 5-year old children to ascertain how well the instrument differentiated between age groups and how consistently items were administered from site to site. A questionnaire administered to these teachers showed generally positive attitudes toward the LAP, and showed that the instrument provided useful information, although further revision was recommended. (CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150149

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

THOMAS
McNAMARA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

THE FIRST USE OF THE LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE (LAP) IN PREKINDERGARTEN HEAD START 1976-1977

Report Prepared by:

David J. Silbermann

of the

Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report Number 77137

Grant Number H 3112

May 1977

Elaine S. Spain
Administrator
Prekindergarten Head Start

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Constance E. Clayton
Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director
Office of Research and Evaluation

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

TM006 472

ABSTRACT

Teachers and aides in the Prekindergarten Head Start Program were trained on the Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) during the Summer and Fall of 1976. The LAP was introduced as a replacement for the Denver Developmental Screening Test (DDST) in the Fall of 1976. It is an objective checklist rather than a test; its focus is on development in seven areas: Gross Motor, Fine Motor Manipulation, Fine Motor Writing, Social, Self-Help, Cognitive, and Language.

Data sheets collected in December were grouped into three age groups (3's, 4's, and 5's) for each site, and "total skills mastered" were counted for each child. Skill mastery was determined by program staff, and local percentiles were employed for summarizing group data.

The median number of skills attained per developmental area was used to ascertain (1) how well the instrument appeared to differentiate between age groups and (2) how consistently items were administered and skills assessed from site to site. It was concluded that the checklist served the program well as a beginning point, but that further refinement in items and better definitions of skill mastery must be made.

The data were used to provide feedback to teachers by alerting them to children who might need special attention from the staff as evidenced by the relatively low profile scores in three or more developmental areas. LAP checklists were completed by the staff for 84% (650) of the 774 children. Of those with LAP scores, 26% (173) were identified as having a low level of skills in three or more areas. Further, 60% of these children evidence

little skill development in at least one Motor area, one Social area, and one Cognitive area.

A questionnaire developed by ECEU staff revealed generally positive attitudes about the LAP for its first round in the Prekindergarten Head Start Program. However, in view of the LAP's need for further refinements, a committee comprised of persons from various School District of Philadelphia prekindergarten programs has been meeting regularly to make item revisions, to provide better definitions of terms, and thus to increase its "site to site" reliability. Following this effort, a summer trial of the revised instrument is planned, and the instrument will be introduced into the remaining prekindergarten programs in the coming year.

THE FIRST USE OF THE LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE (LAP) IN PREKINDERGARTEN HEAD START 1976-1977

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Fall of 1976, Prekindergarten Head Start of the School District of Philadelphia introduced the Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) as its measure of children's developmental status. This summary of the initial effort examines two major areas of concern:

1. The adequacy of the LAP instrument when used by program staff to document the development of children between the ages of three and six years.
2. The preliminary results from this initial use of the LAP.

The Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) is not a "test", but a "checklist" system for documenting the development of children from three to six years of age. It is designed to provide information about a child's mastery of skills in seven developmental areas: Gross Motor, Fine Motor Manipulation, Fine Motor Writing, Social, Self-Help, Cognitive, and Language. It was introduced into the program in the Fall of 1976 to replace the Denver Developmental Screening Test (D.D.S.T.) which had been used for the two previous years. Specific behaviors form the basis for LAP items, behaviors which have been consistently proposed as highly significant developmentally in a variety of widely recognized studies of child development. It was proposed that teachers use the LAP as a structured observation device. They were requested either to encourage or to ask children directly to perform the specific

2-C

behaviors required by the item as a part of the ongoing program. They then then asked to record for each child the date of the observation, whether the child evidenced mastery of the skill, and to add any comments about the behaviors which provided further information on the child's performance.

The LAP was selected for the program because it appeared to provide more reliable profiles of skill areas, and because of its potential usefulness to teachers. It has many more items per area than the D.D.S.T., and therefore could provide a more detailed, reliable overview of each child's development. Further, the checklist is accompanied by a "curriculum resource" manual which offers a wide variety of appropriate activities related to the different aspects of development. It is also general enough to be useful to a wide range of programs with varying developmental/educational philosophies. The results, finally, can be used to alert teachers to those children whose developmental status is much different from their peers, and when results become regularly available, eventually profiles of centers may be produced to guide reexaminations of curricula.

Staff Training

During the Summer of 1976, forty-three (44%) of the 96 teachers and aides in the program spent about fourteen hours in workshops designed to acquaint them with the LAP. The training was centered on basic child development issues and the relationships of child development to specific items on the LAP.

The Early Childhood Evaluation Unit conducted brief training sessions for twenty-five teachers and aides, in small groups, in October and November, with special emphasis placed on centers where few staff members had attended the summer workshops. The Unit's staff made themselves available to those

who requested more help immediately following the training and throughout the period of time the LAP was in use. This additional training centered on the administration and interpretation of specific items and on the mechanics of "scoring." The Instructional Coordinators for the program provided further ongoing help and clarification regarding the use of the LAP.

Methods of Administration

Beginning in September of 1976, all teachers and aides used the LAP with their children on an ongoing basis until December when the materials were collected for analysis to establish a "pre" data point correlative to "post" analysis in June. Teachers often "customized," it was later discovered, the administration of the LAP according to their particular curriculum model and according to the staff available. That is, when they "encouraged or asked children" to do the various behaviors, this was not done in a uniform way. At some centers the items were incorporated into regular program functions; in other centers one staff member concentrated on administering the LAP to small groups of children until it had been administered to all. In still other centers, one staff person was exclusively assigned to review the entire checklist with each child, one at a time.

It appears that the more "individualized" methods caused more difficulties in scheduling staff-time and maintaining the "regular" program than when the administration of the LAP was made an integral part of the daily routine. But, for almost all sites there were some types of problems, i.e., with constructing or collecting specific material, deciding how to ask children to perform the behaviors, and deciding how to recognize mastery.

An additional problem was checking the skills of those children who were frequently absent. The elimination of these problems has been a major concern of the Evaluation Unit since the "preadministration" of the LAP.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE (LAP) AS A DEVELOPMENTAL MEASURE

This initial use of the LAP provides some empirical basis for judging its measurement characteristics and how well it was administered and put to use as a source of program planning. The results in this latter respect, are intended to be useful as a signal to teachers to give particular attention to those children whose developmental status appears to be behind that of their peers. The remainder of this section is devoted to some considerations of the LAP's measurement properties. Specific information about children's performance will be discussed in the subsequent section, INITIAL RESULTS.

Scoring Procedures

The LAP, as noted earlier, is not so much a test as a structured observation device for teachers. If one attempts to categorize it in terms of test types, it falls under the general heading of criterion-referenced instruments. The author provides a developmental age scale for the instrument, but it is clear from the directions that there are no exactly predetermined scoring procedures. ECEU staff made the decision to convert all raw scores from the first administrations of the LAP to local percentiles and gradually, over the years, construct a more refined data based, developmental age scale.

The children's Lap Record Sheets were collected from the Head Start Centers and sorted into three groups: Group A was composed of children who had birthdays from June 1973 through May 1974 (2½ to 3½ years of age

as of December 1, 1976); Group B children had birthdays from June 1972 through May 1973 (3½ to 4½); and Group C children had birthdays from June 1971 through May 1972 (4½ to 5½).

For each record sheet, for each developmental area, the number of items the child had mastered (noted in the "+" column on the sheet) were counted. (See sample record sheet for scoring alternatives.) If a record sheet showed no marks for developmentally earlier items, but there was a series of marks for "older" items, then all the previous items were counted as though they had been recorded "+". If a subsection (developmental area) had fewer than three marks all told (regardless of how the 3 marks were distributed in the mastery, partial mastery, or no mastery categories), then the information for that subsection was not included. The rationale for this was that the lack of information might simply have meant the child was absent too often to check the area or that, in any case, the information was insufficient to assign an area score. All raw scores were then converted to local percentiles.

The median scores for each center's three age groups were determined, as were the medians for the three age groups within the total program. These data were uniformly reported except under special conditions: i.e., except where the record sheets from a center evidenced a non-typical reporting procedure, and where a group contained less than ten members.

Finally, the range of scores of the lowest quarter for each entire group, Group A, Group B, and Group C, were established for each developmental area. All children whose total mastery of skills in three or more developmental areas fell into that range were reported by name to the center staff. Staff members were asked to consider the child's developmental record in

light of the recording procedure used and the child's age. If neither of these were thought to be factors which might have a negative effect on a child's development record, then the staff were asked to pay particular attention to that child's program and developmental progress.

Preliminary Examination of the LAP's Measurement Properties; Consistency in Administration

The median scores developed through the scoring procedures noted above were used to investigate the suitability of the instrument for use as a developmental measure, as well as to check on the consistency with which the LAP was administered. Three criteria were used to give focus to this examination. The first criterion was that the median for one group of children should exceed that for another group if the first was older than the second. The second criterion was that the medians of each of the groups should fall within the middle ranges of LAP scores (neither "topping" nor "bottoming" out). The third criterion was that the different centers' medians for groups of children in the same age should not vary beyond reasonable limits. A "reasonable limit" was set equal to one quarter of the number of items in the subsection.

Table 1 displays the medians for each of the three groups for each subsection. For the entire program, in every subsection of the LAP, the Group C children had higher medians than Group B children, who in turn had higher medians than Group A children. Thus the first empirical adequacy criterion was met.

Table 1 also displays the "middle range" of each subsection. According to the second criterion, all of the medians should fall within these limits

(between 25% and 75% of the possible items per subsection).

TABLE 1

THE MIDDLE RANGES AND GROUP MEDIANS FOR LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE (LAP) DEVELOPMENTAL AREAS, 1976

Developmental Area	Subsection Middle Range	Group Medians A	B	C
Gross Motor	6 - 17	11	15	17
Fine Motor Manipulation	5 - 14	11	13	14.5
Fine Motor Writing	7 - 21	3	8	13
Social Skills	10 - 28	16	23	29
Self Help	7 - 21	15	19	22
Cognitive	13 - 38	14	26	35
Language	7 - 22	12	19	23

Sixteen of the twenty-one median scores are within the desired range. The five exceptions are Fine Motor Writing (Group A) and Fine Motor Manipulation, Social Skills, Self-Help, and Language (Group C). However, of these, only the median for Group A's Fine Motor Writing is well outside (below) the limit. Thus, except for one developmental area, the LAP again essentially provides a suitable measure of children's development appropriate for these different age groups.

The third criterion required that differences among medians for the same age group for each center should not exceed a value greater than one quarter of the total possible items. This criterion specifically emphasized the degree to which the LAP was consistently administered. Since medians could not be reported for all of the Group A and Group C children (the numbers of children were often less than ten), only Group B medians could be tested

against the criterion. Table 2 displays the differences between the highest and lowest Group B medians for each center, and, for each developmental area, compares that value to one quarter of the total possible items.

TABLE 2

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE HIGHEST AND LOWEST MEDIANS FROM EACH CENTER COMPARED TO THE VALUE FOR ONE QUARTER OF THE TOTAL POSSIBLE ITEMS - 1976 LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE (LAP)

Developmental Area	One Quarter of Subsection's Items	Widest Difference Between Centers' Group B Medians	Difference Less Than One Quarter
Gross Motor	6	10.5	No
Fine Motor Manipulation	5	4	Yes
Fine Motor Writing	7	17	No
Social Skills	10	18.5	No
Self-Help	7	8.5	No
Cognitive	13	15.0	No
Language	7	9	No

Of the seven comparisons, only one was less than the permissible variation (Fine Motor Manipulation). Three of the subsection variations approached a value two times the established amount. Thus this criterion was not met, and it cannot be said, as a result, that the LAP was used in a consistent way among the centers. The findings for this criterion may well be somewhat confounded with developmental variation, but they seem to argue more convincingly for variation in administration.

In examining the results section that follows, then, it should be kept in mind that two important measurement considerations seem to have

been satisfied in this first use of the LAP. Because the criterion established to examine reliability of administration more directly was not met, however, the results must be viewed in a framework of caution.

III INITIAL RESULTS

Program Status Information

Of the 774 children enrolled in Head Start at the end of November 1976, 653 LAP record sheets were submitted to the Evaluation Unit for analysis. Table 3 shows the percentage of records submitted for each center. Some of the percentages exceed 100 because the enrollment figure cited is that on the last day of the month, and it is possible that children who were screened with the LAP were dropped earlier and new children added and screened. This practice could have produced more records than children in the program. Eleven centers submitted LAP records for 90% or more of their children, two submitted records for 80% to 89% of their children; one each 50% and 47%, and one did not respond in time with any records. These data are found in Table 3.

For the 653 LAP record sheets submitted, since each had seven subsections, there were potentially 4,571 developmental areas (653x7) to examine and process. Of these, 96% were found to be complete enough to tally according to the procedure outlined previously. The percentage of complete subsections among the 17 reporting centers ranged from 86% to 100% of the records returned.

Table 4 shows total program median scores for each subsection for each age group (Group A, Group B, and Group C). These data were discussed previously but are restated for easy reference in comparing any one center to the overall program.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF RECORDS SUBMITTED BY EACH CENTER
LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE (LAP) FALL, 1976

Center Code Number	Number Enrolled on Nov. 30, 1976	LAP Records Submitted	Percentage Submitted
1	52	38	73
2	36	18	50
3	33	00	00
4	45	46	102 *
5	36	37	103 *
6	54	47	87
7	49	43	98
8	68	61	90
9	50	52	104 *
10	34	32	94
11	36	36	100
12	52	52	100
13	36	35	97
14	53	50	94
15	54	47	87
16	22	21	95
17	28	21	75
18	36	17	47

* Children who were added to the roll, screened with the LAP and dropped before November 30 account for percentages greater than 100.

TABLE 4

MEDIAN NUMBER OF ITEMS MASTERED FOR EACH AGE GROUP ON EACH SUBTEST

PREKINDERGARTEN HEAD START

LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE; (LAP) FALL, 1976

	Age Group A N=117*	Age Group B N=355*	Age Group C N=149*
Gross Motor (23 items)	11	15	17
Fine Motor Manipulation (19 items)	11	13	14.5
Fine Motor Writing (26 items)	3	8	13
Social (38 items)	16	23	29
Self Help (26 items)	15	19	22
Cognitive (51 items)	14	26	35
Language (29 items)	12	19	23

* N's vary for individual subsections. The N given is based on the "Gross Motor" subsection.

TABLE 5

MEDIAN NUMBER OF ITEMS MASTERED FOR EACH AGE GROUP, ON EACH SUBTEST, BY CENTER

LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE, (LAP) FALL, 1976

Center Code	N	Gross Motor			Fine Motor Manipulation			Fine Motor Writing			Social			Self-Help			Cognitive			Language		
		A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
1	38	*	13			12			7			23			18			26			15	
2	18		11			11			6			11			13.5			19.5			16	
3	00																					
4	46		18			14.5			12.5			29.5			20			34.5			23	
5	37		8	10		11.5			6	12.5		12			15			19.5	27.5		14	
6	47		14			13			11			25			20			23			22.5	
7	43		13			14			12			23			20			24.5			19.5	
8	61	8	16	19	8	12	13	2	9	11	11.5	27	26.5	9.5	19	20	11	27	26.5	4	19	16
9	52	12	13	18	12	13	15	5	5	16	15.5	18	30.5	18	17	24	13.5	22	36.5	8	12	24
10	32	**																				
11	36		11	15		12	13		5	8.5		13	23.5		14	23		28.5	37.5		17	16
12	52	12	14.5	15	9.5	11	10	4	7	15	29	26	23.5	19	20	20	18	25	32	19	20	19
13	35	12	16		12	15		1	7		17	24		16	22		11	23		10	17	
14	50	10	15.5	17	11	13	16	3.5	9	17	13	27.5	35		19.5	23	13	23.5	38		21.5	26.5
15	47		18.5			14			7.5			25			19.5			31			22	24
16	21																					
17	21		15.5			9			8.5			25.5			21			24			17.5	
18	17																					

* Blanks indicate that the group contained less than ten members.

** No data are reported for this center, because the checklist was completed in discrepant form and the results were not comparable with other centers.

Table 5 shows each center's median scores for each subsection for each of the age groups (providing the criteria for reporting were met as outlined above.)

In the case of three centers there were clear patterns in the results which are worthwhile discussing.

Using the scores from age group B, Center Number Two and Center Number Five had median scores below the overall program medians on all seven subsections. Center Number Four had median scores above the overall program medians on all seven subsections. In the other eleven centers with complete data in the B group for all subsections, there were no definite patterns revealed through visual inspection.

There were 173 children (26% of 653) for whom the number of items mastered fell below the fourth quartile in three or more subsections. Of that number, 103 children (60% of the 173 or 16% of the total population) fell below the 25th percentile in each of three groupings of subsections. One group combined the three motor areas (Gross Motor Fine Motor Manipulation, Fine Motor Writing), the second combined the two social areas (Social and Self-Help), and the third combined two cognitive areas (Cognitive and Language). The names of the children were reported to the staff. The number of children per center so noted are given in Table 6. For the individual centers, the percentages of children scoring below the twenty-fifth percentile in the three basic areas varied between 0% to 43% (this is not always a reliable indicator, however, since there are different size groups of children).

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH SCORES BELOW THE 25TH PERCENTILE

LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE; (LAP) FALL, 1976

Center Code	N	Gross Motor			Fine Motor Manipulation			Fine Motor Writing			Social			Self-Help			Cognitive			Language		
		A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
1	38	2	7	0	1	4	0	2	5	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	6	0	2	6	0
2	18	0	4	3	1	4	2	1	4	2	1	5	4	0	3	4	0	4	1	0	1	1
3	00	*			0																	
4	46	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
5	37	4	9	5	0	8	5	0	7	4	4	10	5	0	8	4	3	9	5	1	6	4
6	47	1	6	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	1	6	1	0	5	1	0	4	1	1	6	0
7	43	2	4	1	4	2	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	5	2	3	2	2	5	5	2
8	61	6	3	2	5	3	2	3	2	2	5	4	3	0	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	4
9	52	1	4	0	0	3	0	2	5	0	2	6	0	0	4	0	3	4	0	2	4	0
10	32	**																				
11	36	0	6	2	0	3	2	0	8	3	0	8	1	0	7	1	0	3	1	0	4	3
12	52	0	4	2	0	4	3	0	3	3	0	4	2	0	1	2	0	6	3	0	5	2
13	35	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	1
14	50	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	3	1	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	2
15	47	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	5	0
16	21	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	2	1	1
17	21	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
18	17	1	1	0	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	0

* No records submitted.

** No data is reported for this center, because the checklists were completed in discrepant form and the results are not comparable with other centers.

Follow-up Procedures with Program Staff

A general meeting was held with all Prekindergarten Head Start teachers to report on Fall data and to answer questions about the LAP's continued use. At that time, the following recommendations were made for ongoing use of the instrument until post-data are collected in late May or early June:

1. The date that an item is administered should be written in the appropriate performance column ("+", "-", or "½".)
2. All of the items that have a date written in the "+" column will be counted. There are two implications to this guideline:
   a. All items that a child can do should be dated in the plus column. For an older child, it is necessary to date the early items that the teacher is certain the child can do.
   b. As many items as necessary should be scored to give what the teacher considers to be an accurate picture of each child on each subsection.

IV. FURTHER REFINEMENT/DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAP

Feedback From Teachers

In an effort to assess the teachers' reactions toward this first use of the LAP, all classroom staff were asked to complete a short, anonymous questionnaire. Fifty-eight percent, of teachers and aides responded to the four-point, Likert-type scale. Table 7 is in the format of the questionnaire, and indicates, in parenthesis, the frequency and percentage of responses for each item. The most emphatic responses by staff indicated that their use of the LAP required considerable

TABLE 7

EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION UNIT

TEACHER FEEDBACK--LEARNING ACCOMPLISHMENT PROFILE

(FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE) N=56

1. Because of the LAP, my knowledge about the current skills of the children that I teach has:

increased greatly	increased some	increased slightly	remained the same	No Response
(8)14%	(28)50%	(14)25%	(6)11%	(0)0%

2. I was able to use the LAP as an integral part of instructional planning:

totally	mostly	slightly	not at all	No Response
(2) 4%	(25) 45%	(23)41%	(6)11%	(0)0%

3. The amount of extra work that was necessary for me to administer the LAP was:

very great	great	slight	none	No Response
(1.)30%	(23)41%	(11)20%	(2)4%	(3)5%

4. I used the [illegible] Curriculum Guide as a teaching aid:

constantly	often	seldom	never	No Response
(2)4%	(27)48%	(16)29%	(6)11%	(5)9%

5. The information provided by the LAP helped me to discuss children more knowledgeably with other staff:

strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	No Response
(1)2%	(40)71%	(12)21%	(2)4%	(1)2%

6. The information provided by the LAP helped me to discuss children more knowledgeably with parents:

strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	No Response
(4)7%	(37)66%	(13)23%	(2)4%	(0)0%

7. The information that I gained from the LAP helped me to determine which children should be referred for special supportive services:

strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	No Response
(4)7%	(33)59%	(16)29%	(2)4%	(1)2%

8. The information that I gained from the LAP helped me to create a more individualized program:

strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	No Response
(2)4%	(38)68%	(15)27%	(1)2%	(0)0%

9. In general, I thought that using the LAP:

was of great benefit	was of some benefit	detracted somewhat from the program	detracted greatly from the program	No Response
(14)25%	(30)54%	(11)20%	(1)2%	(0)0%

extra effort, but the knowledge gained about individual children was useful for discussions with parents, creating a more individualized program, and assisted in determining which children needed special supportive services. Answers to two open-ended questions relating to the LAP's strengths and weaknesses supported these general conclusions. (Responses for the two items are not summarized.)

Formation of a LAP Review Committee

As a result of the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit's experience gained from the LAP's initial use and the feedback from Head Start teachers, a committee representing all preschool programs was formed to review the LAP items and format. The main goal of this committee is to make the LAP as valid, useful, and efficient as possible. There were two overriding concerns:

1. Reliable administration depends heavily on concise self-explanatory items.
2. Items must easily blend into an ongoing early childhood program and be perceived by teachers as a useful adjunct to the curriculum rather than a task imposed from the outside.

With these concerns in mind, subgroups of the committee reviewed the items in each developmental subsection and made additions and deletions as necessary. The committee is to convene again to provide input to a final draft which will incorporate all their modifications. It is planned that the final version of the developmental checklist (revised by the committee) will be used in Get Set Day Care beginning in the early summer of 1977. Experience gained from that summer trial should identify the need for any wording changes or areas needing most attention in training supervisors and staff for full implementation in all prekindergarten sites in 1977-1978.

IV CONCLUSIONS

The LAP, used as a checklist of developmental behaviors, will be a useful instrument for the Prekindergarten Head Start Program. Not only does it contain numerous developmental items which are related to a volume of curriculum suggestions, but it was found to meet two practical criteria when administered on a pre-basis this year. The first criterion was that older children should evidence a mastery of more skills than younger children; the second was that the span of skills be large enough to permit extremes in development to be recorded and noticed.

However, the LAP does not, on the basis of the pre-data, have sufficiently precise directions for administering items nor for deciding what behaviors indicate mastery of a developmental skill. It was discovered that a number of sites administered items differently, and that different interpretations of mastery were employed. This conclusion was borne out by the large variation in group medians when compared from site to site, given groups of children of the same age. Every effort has been made to insure more uniform use of the instrument during the remainder of 1976-1977.

Data returned to program sites summarized the status of three different age-groups (3's, 4's, and 5's) in each of the seven developmental categories by providing comparisons to locally developed norms. Program staff were urged to use the individual profiles with caution because of the variations in administration noted above. However, teachers were given the

names of all children whose LAP records indicated that their performance was far below that of their peers. It appears that the LAP will be suitable for determining an individual child's developmental progress for the purposes of referral for specialized testing, and for curriculum individualization, but it will be necessary to revise some items and to plan for more thorough training of teaching staff in the future in order to achieve a more uniform administration.

As a result of this first use of the LAP, a revision committee consisting of prekindergarten program personnel has been convened. Following the production of a re-drafted LAP checklist by the committee, summer trial implementation will be used to lead to final refinements.

References

Findlay, J., Miller, P., Pegram, A., Richey, L., Sanford, A., and Semrau, B. A Planning Guide to the Preschool Curriculum: The Child, the Process, the Day. Winston - Salem: Kaplan Press, 1976.

Frankenburg, W. K., and Dodds, J. B. Denver Developmental Screening Test. Denver: University of Colorado Medical Center, 1970.

Sanford, A. R. (Ed.). A Manual for use of the Learning Accomplishment Profile. Winston-Salem: Kaplan Press, 1976.

Sanford, A. R. Learning Accomplishment Profile. Winston - Salem: Kaplan Press.